DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 758 SO 016 575

TITLE	U.S. Participation in International, Scientific, Educational, Cultural, and Communications Fields in the Absence of U.S. Membership in UNESCO. Report prepared for the Subcommittees on Human Rights and International Organizations and on International Operations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. U.S. House of Representatives, Ninety-Ninth Congress, First Session.
INSTITUTION	Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. Congressional Research Service.
SPONS AGENCY	Congress of the U. S., Washington, D. C. House Committee on Foreign Affairs.
REPORT NO	House-R-45-190
PUB DATE	1 Mar 85
NOTE	75p.; Contains small print throughout.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Civil Liberties; *Communications; Copyrights; *Cultural Activities; Females; Feminism; Information Dissemination; Information Services; International Cooperation; *International Education; *International Programs; Natural Sciences; Participation; Program Evaluation; *Sciences; Social Sciences; Statistical Data
IDENTIFIERS	*UNESCO; *United States

ABSTRACT

This report contains the results of an evaluation of the impact of U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO on various international educational, scientific, and cultural activities. The study was undertaken to assist Congressional subcommittees in considering the Reagan administration's fiscal year 1986-87 requests for contributions to the United Nations' agencies and programs following U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO. The report discusses concerns in the following areas: Education; Communications and Culture; Natural Sciences; Social Sciences, Human Rights, and Women's Issues; The General Information Program; Statistical Services; and Copyright. Background information on major issues and concerns is provided. One concern common to all areas is the future role of the Soviet Union in the UNESCO program. It is feared that the Soviet Union, upon U.S. withdrawal, would use its increased influence to redirect toward statist themes the UNESCO programs that are currently highly regarded in the United States. In addition, the Soviets might use the already well established UNESCO networks to increase their influence in the Third World. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED257758

99th Congress
1st Session

COMMITTEE PRINT

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC, EDUCATIONAL, CULTURAL, AND COMMUNICATIONS FIELDS IN THE ABSENCE OF U.S. MEMBERSHIP IN UNESCO

REPORT

PREPARED FOR THE

SUBCOMMITTEES ON
HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS

AND ON

INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

BY THE

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

MARCH 1, 1985

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

45-190 O

WASHINGTON : 1985

SD 016 575

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida, *Chairman*

LEE H. HAMILTON, Indiana
GUS YATRON, Pennsylvania
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
DON BONKER, Washington
GERRY E. STUDDS, Massachusetts
DAN MICA, Florida
MICHAEL D. BARNES, Maryland
HOWARD WOLPE, Michigan
GEO. W. CROCKETT, Jr., Michigan
SAM GEJDENSON, Connecticut
MERVYN M. DYMALLY, California
TOM LANTOS, California
PETER H. KOSTMAYER, Pennsylvania
ROBERT G. TORRICELLI, New Jersey
LAWRENCE J. SMITH, Florida
HOWARD L. BERMAN, California
HARRY M. REID, Nevada
MEL LEVINE, California
EDWARD F. FEIGHAN, Ohio
TED WEISS, New York
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
BUDDY MacKAY, Florida
MORRIS K. UDALL, Arizona
ROBERT GARCIA, New York

WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, Michigan
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO, California
JIM LEACH, Iowa
TOBY ROTH, Wisconsin
OLYMPIA J. SNOWE, Maine
HENRY J. HYDE, Illinois
GERALD B.H. SOLOMON, New York
DOUG BEREUTER, Nebraska
MARK D. SILJANDER, Michigan
ED ZSCHAU, California
ROBERT K. DORNAN, California
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
CONNIE MACK, Florida
MICHAEL DeWINE, Ohio
DAN BURTON, Indiana
JOHN McCAIN, Arizona

JOHN J. BRADY, Jr., *Chief of Staff*
MARGARET E. GALEY, *Staff Consultant*
MARGO GRIMM, *Staff Assistant*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

GUS YATRON, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
DON BONKER, Washington
TOM LANTOS, California
EDWARD F. FEIGHAN, Ohio
GEO. W. CROCKETT, Jr., Michigan

GERALD B.H. SOLOMON, New York
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
MARK D. SILJANDER, Michigan
DAN BURTON, Indiana

MARK J. TAVLARIDES, *Subcommittee Staff Director*
DAVID LONIE, *Minority Staff Consultant*
BERNADETTE PAOLO, *Subcommittee Staff Consultant*
KERRY BOLOGNESE, *Subcommittee Staff Consultant*
SHIRLEY DAWSON, *Staff Assistant*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS

DAN MICA, Florida, *Chairman*

GUS YATRON, Pennsylvania
PETER H. KOSTMAYER, Pennsylvania
LAWRENCE J. SMITH, Florida
TED WEISS, New York
BUDDY MacKAY, Florida

OLYMPIA J. SNOWE, Maine
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
CONNIE MACK, Florida
JOHN McCAIN, Arizona

RICHARD W. McBRIDE, *Subcommittee Staff Director*
CAROLEEN L. WILLIAMS, *Minority Staff Consultant*
SUSAN McCARTAN ANDROSS, *Subcommittee Staff Consultant*
THOMAS BRUCE, *Subcommittee Staff Consultant*

FOREWORD

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, March 1, 1984.

Following the U.S. announcement of its intent to withdraw from UNESCO the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, chaired by the Honorable Gus Yatron, and the Subcommittee on International Operations, chaired by the Honorable Dan Mica, held extensive hearings on the question of the withdrawal. The committee also sponsored staff study missions to UNESCO.

As part of its continuing oversight of U.S. relations with international organizations, the respective subcommittees requested the Congressional Research Service to provide an assessment of the possible impact of U.S. withdrawal on UNESCO program sectors. The report, therefore, does not necessarily reflect the views of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or of its members. However, it is hoped that the report will be useful to Members of Congress and the public as they review the situation with respect to UNESCO in coming months.

DANTE B. FASCELL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs.

LETTER OF SUBMITTAL

WASHINGTON, DC, *March 18, 1985.*

Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In anticipation of U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO in December 1984, we requested the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress to assist us in evaluating the impact of U.S. withdrawal on various international educational, scientific, and cultural activities including the impact of U.S. business. We expected that such a study would assist the work of our respective subcommittees in considering the administration's fiscal year 1986–87 requests for contributions to the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and programs.

The Congressional Research Service provided the subcommittees in early March a report attached herewith. This report was prepared by Ray Copson, Lois McHugh, and Joel Woldman of CRS' Foreign Affairs and National Defense Division and by Genevieve J. Knezo and Michael E. Davey of the Science Policy Research Division. The section on copyright was prepared at the request of CRS by Patricia Lyons, Senior Attorney Advisor of the Library of Congress' Copyright Office. Lois McHugh served as project coordinator. Susan Andross of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Peggy Galey of the full committee staff worked with CRS to plan and advise on the report.

The report has been useful to our hearings. Because it is a subject potentially of interest to various groups of American scientists, educators, and social scientists, and should be useful to U.S. officials as well as concerned citizens, we believe the CRS report should be printed and circulated. The questions raised in the report itself were raised in the hearings held by the Subcommittee on International Operations and answers will appear in the printed hearing on U.S. assessed budgets for fiscal year 1986.

We hope you and other members will find the report helpful in considering the situation of the United States in UNESCO.

Sincerely,

Hon. GUS YATRON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations,
Hon. DAN MICA,
Chairman, Subcommittee on International Operations.

CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	III
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL	V
OVERVIEW	1
EDUCATION:	
Education Programs	5
International Bureau of Education	11
COMMUNICATIONS AND CULTURE:	
Communications Programs	14
Cultural Programs	18
NATURAL SCIENCES:	
Funding for UNESCO Science	22
Impact on U.S. Participation in UNESCO Programs	25
Impacts on Foreign Policy	27
Impacts on U.S. Business	30
Effects on Research and Information Exchange	33
Science Education	36
SOCIAL SCIENCES, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND WOMEN'S ISSUES:	
Social Science Programs	43
Social Science Development	47
Women's Issues and Human Rights	50
Peace Research and Disarmament	53
GENERAL INFORMATION PROGRAM	55
STATISTICAL SERVICES	62
COPYRIGHT	64

OVERVIEW

This paper presents background information and related questions for use in hearings that may relate to UNESCO. It is an attempt to identify the major concerns of American experts in the UNESCO fields and anticipated problems to U.S. commercial or scholarly interests. Finally, it attempts to identify alternatives to UNESCO programs. At the time that this paper was prepared, the Administration had proposed a U.S. contribution to UNESCO-like programs of $2.75 million. Time did not allow this to be a comprehensive review of the opinions of all Americans involved in UNESCO. Contact was made primarily with persons who could speak for groups of people or industries. Additionally, since the report is being prepared as background for questions to be used in hearings, it does not necessarily present a balanced view in all areas. Information on the UNESCO natural sciences section was drawn largely from a previous report prepared by the National Academy of Sciences.

Although the analysts involved have noted different concerns in the respective UNESCO programs, there were several common concerns.

By far the most frequently mentioned concern is the future role of the Soviet Union in UNESCO programs. In nearly all the UNESCO sectors, this was mentioned as a concern. There were two distinct themes for this alarm. First, that the Soviet Union would use its increased influence to redirect toward statist themes the UNESCO programs that are currently highly regarded in the United States. In many areas, such as vocational and technical education, communications, and human rights, the Soviet Union has already made great efforts to redirect the focus of UNESCO

programs. In their present position as the largest contributor to UNESCO, the concern is that this trend will accelerate.

The second area is that the Soviets can use the already well established UNESCO networks to increase their influence in the Third World. They can use their strong multilateral position to enhance their bilateral aid programs.

Question: This administration has emphasized the threat to U.S. interests of Soviet propaganda and other forms of influence in the Third World. We were able in some measure to limit such Soviet influence in UNESCO when we were a member. What will happen to the extent of Soviet influence now that we have left? What do you plan to do to counter it?

A second area of concern was the loss of U.S. influence over Third World development programs in the UNESCO areas. The Third World relies on UNESCO to provide much of the infrastructure for their programs in science, education, culture, and communications. UNESCO translates textbooks, establishes teacher training programs, provides equipment and consultants, and establishes curriculum in a variety of areas. By withdrawing from UNESCO, the United States has abdicated playing any significant role in many Third World development projects. In both the science and education areas, there is already evidence that American involvement in UNESCO programs will not be continued.

A related concern is that U.S. withdrawal gives many Third World countries the impression that the United States has no interest in Third World development problems.

Question: Throughout the 1984 debate over whether the United States would withdraw from UNESCO, Asst. Sec. Newell repeatedly stated that the United States would continue to devote the same amount of money ($47 million) to alternatives to UNESCO. In some important areas, viable alternatives have been identified. What are your plans for providing funds for alternative programs?

In addition to losing influence over Third World development programs, the United States also loses visibility in Third World. Most people agree that participation of Americans as experts and consultants, translation of U.S. books and publications, and use of U.S. equipment will decline.

Concern was also expressed over loss of contact with experts in other countries. Many Americans fear loss of invitations to important international meetings, whether sponsored by UNESCO or not. In both the education and scientific fields, this appears to be happening already.

Question: In many cases, U.S. participation in UNESCO meetings and projects is provided by private citizens. In many of the suggested alternatives to UNESCO, private citizens represent the United States. Will the United States continue to support private participation in UNESCO programs or in some of the alternatives suggested? Will there be funds available for this purpose?

Many expressed concern that without U.S. participation, the quality of UNESCO programs will decline. A decline in funds available to some of the programs will have a serious adverse affect of them. Reducing the number of Americans participating in UNESCO programs will affect the level of expertise.

Question: Many UNESCO programs have been established and largely continued with the close involvement of American experts. (UNESCO's high school science education program and textbooks prepared on teaching illiterates are two excellent examples.) What effect will the decreasing involvement of American in UNESCO have on the quality of the development programs or the expertise available to developing countries in these fields?

Many expressed concern about the inability of the United States to play a leading role in 6 of the 9 principle bodies established by UNESCO. According to a legal memorandum reportedly prepared by the Department of State, of the 9 principle bodies established by UNESCO, the U.S. can continue to participate in only 3:

the Board of the International Geological Correlation Program,

the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, and
the Intergovernmental Copyright Committee.

The U.S. cannot participate in:

the International Coordinating Council on Man and the Biosphere,
the Intergovernmental Council of the International Program for the Development of Communications,
the Coordinating Council of the International Hydrological Decade,
the Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Country of Origin or Restitution in Case of Illicit Appropriation,
the International Bureau of Education,
the Intergovernmental Committee for Physical Education and Sport, and,
the International Council for the General Information Program.

The United States also loses the opportunity to influence UNESCO regulatory activities that we need. Standard setting, education planning, book promotion, equipment sales, free flow of information, and other communications issues.

Question: Lack of participation in several of the above organizations will have a financial impact on American business, as well our inability to maintain a U.S. government role in regulatory activities sponsored by UNESCO. How does the United States plan to maintain U.S. influence in those UNESCO bodies in which we cannot continue as members? How will we maintain our influence in international regulatory issues under the auspices of UNESCO? How will this affect American business interests?

EDUCATION

Education Programs

Issue: Will the direction of the UNESCO education programs change as a result of U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO?

Background

The education sector is by far the largest of the UNESCO areas. In the 1984/85 budget, $84 million or nearly 40 percent of the program budget is in the three education programs. In addition, another $91 million in program funds are administered by UNESCO for other international organizations, primarily the World Bank, U.N. Development Program and the U.N. Fund for Population Activities.

Education is the most important of the UNESCO areas to the Third World. Many countries rely on UNESCO for educational program planning, research, and training. Soviet interest in this sector is strong, and observers believe that the Soviets seek to use it as a means of influencing the educational programs of developing countries. The current head of the Education Sector is a Soviet national who has spent most of his career in the UNESCO Education Sector.

In the 1984/85 budget, $31 million of the UNESCO regular budget and $24 million of other funds are dedicated to one major program, the Education for All program. This program contains the literacy programs of UNESCO. Some of these programs are highly regarded by U.S. government and private educational experts. Others are not. Some program money is used for conferences, which many critics feel are unnecessary. This program also contains the assistance programs for refugees and members

---

*Prepared by Lois McHugh, Foreign Affairs Analyst

of certain "liberation movements" which have been criticized by the United States.

The focus of the Education for All program is the application of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to education. The United States has been instrumental in maintaining that focus. Several subprograms emphasize literacy training for girls and women, the handicapped, and refugees and migrants.

Other education programs have been modeled on U.S. ideas. UNESCO's early childhood education programs follow the U.S. model of including nutrition, early identification of learning disabilities, and pre-school education as well as elementary education programs.

Many UNESCO programs have also reportedly influenced U.S. thinking in education. One example is the concept of functional illiteracy, which began in UNESCO and has since been adopted by U.S. educators.

Because the education sector is important to the Soviet Union, some programs have been an ideological battleground between the United States and the Soviet Union for many years. For example, UNESCO's programs to make education relevant to work were identified as important in the Department of State July letter to Director-General M'Bow but is also an area where constant attention has been required to maintain a Western focus. These programs, which include vocational and technical training, and adult education, have been subject to a continuing ideological battle over the role of the individual in society. Critics claim that many of these programs already tilt in the direction of the Soviet Union.

Another example of ideological disagreement is the Intergovernmental Committee for Physical Education and Sport which was established in 1976

to coordinate training and other aspects of sports in the developing world. The U.S. has been a member of the 30 member committee since 1976, but cannot continue as a member now that we have left UNESCO. International sports is an area of great interest to the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and Cuba. It is also an area of great interest to Third World countries, because sports offers a poor country the opportunity to excel. The United States has expressed concern in recent years that in the area of sports, UNESCO has favored the Soviet view that sports and access to training should be controlled by the state. Many experts in this area claim that the Soviets use the sports program for propaganda.

Concerns:

Soviet Influence

The most common concern is the fear of future Soviet pressure on the numerous education programs that are among the most effective of UNESCO activities. Many express concern that the Soviets can use the already existing UNESCO programs for exporting their theories on education to the Third World. In many instances, such as vocational education and sports, concern was expressed that U.S. withdrawal leaves a vacuum which will be filled by the Soviet Union. Since the Soviet Union is the largest donor after the United States, and the head of the Education Sector is a Soviet national, they fear that the programs will increasingly reflect Soviet views. Others downplay this concern, contending that many of the education programs already reflect Soviet views. Although the original goal of the programs may have been sound, they argue, the current programs are not and U.S. withdrawal may result in less damage, rather than more.

Many of the programs that the United States supports can be maintained

by alternative means, some point out. For example, the literacy programs can be continued bilaterally or through direct contributions to programs such as the Major Project for Literacy for Latin America and the Caribbean, which is partially supported by UNESCO, but is independent. There are no other comparable regional programs, however. The early education programs are jointly administered by UNESCO and UNICEF. Encouraging future cooperation and increasing the funding for UNICEF would provide a substitute. Bilateral programs of sports medicine, coaching, and physical education could be effective as a substitute to UNESCO. One suggestion is that the American Council for International Sports could take UNESCO's place. This organization reportedly has an international network in place now.

Decline of U.S. Influence

The second concern is that U.S. influence over Third World education programs will decline. UNESCO greatly influences the Third World, according to this view. It provides much of the education planning, training, equipment, textbooks, and scholarly exchange opportunities used by the Third World. The United States has been a leader in education. Even countries which disagree with us accept our leadership in education. The U.S. withdrawal, however, has removed us from UNESCO programs and from an important forum for discussion of education in the Third World. Those programs which have been influenced by the U.S. will no longer emphasize U.S. values. Without the United States, for example, the emphasis on education as a human right will be reduced. Our allies will not take our place on this issue. They do not have the financial or political clout; nor do they have the same level of commitment. The

Soviets and the Eastern European governments will fight hard for their own views. Others are less concerned about the effect of U.S. withdrawal. They argue that the United States will still be a leader in education because the Third World needs our expertise, our textbooks, and our technology. U.S. bilateral programs will be more efficient and will promote our values from this perspective.

Program Quality

In addition to a change in direction of UNESCO, there is concern that the overall quality of UNESCO staff and programs will decline. It is assumed by all, including the State Department, that the number of Americans working in the UNESCO Secretariat or used as consultants, contractors, and participants in meetings will decline. There is already evidence of this.

Some Americans occupy key positions in UNESCO education programs. Additionally, between 1979 and 1983, 330 Americans were given contracts to participate in UNESCO education programs at UNESCO expense. Because of UNESCO's policy of geographical distribution of positions, most of the Americans will likely be replaced by Third World educators. Since the United States is the major source of information on educational planning, research and development, UNESCO will lose significant expertise.

Scholarly Contact

Another concern has been the loss of contact with scholars and educators in other countries. Many of our domestic and bilateral education programs have much in common with programs in other parts of the world, and it could be costly to sacrifice the interchange of ideas that occurs

45-190 O - 85 - 2

through UNESCO. There is even concern that those individuals who now provide information to American scholars outside of UNESCO may feel constrained by their governments or by their peers. Other experts doubt that significant damage will occur to the United States. The U.S. educational community is very strong, and personal ties with other educators as well as U.S. prestige will minimize damage, according to this view.

UNESCO Fellows in the United States

A final concern is the future of the UNESCO fellowship program in the United States. During FY 1983, 324 students studied in the United States under UNESCO auspices. They are a source of good will and they often return to influential positions with an appreciation for American values, products and methods. Others argue that there are over 400,000 foreign students in the United States and that the loss of 324 is not very important. They suggest that U.S. funds would be better spent in developing bilateral university to university exchange programs rather than just encouraging individual student exchanges.

Questions

1. In some areas, such as the Intergovernmental Committee for Physical Education and Sport, the United States is represented by private individuals. Can these people continue to be members? Will they be accredited by the United States? Will their participation be financed by the U.S. government?

2. The World Bank relies on the UNESCO education sector for evaluation of World Bank education programs in developing countries. What do you anticipate will be the effect of decline in American personnel, or the reduction of funds in the Education Sector on the World Bank. Will the World Bank be able to continue to rely on UNESCO?

3. What effect will U.S. withdrawal have on UNESCO fellows studying in this country?

4. What value do you think the Soviet Union places on the UNESCO education programs? What do you anticipate will be the effect of the Soviet Assistant Director General on the direction of the programs?

International Bureau of Education

Issue: The future of the International Bureau of Education and INED

Background

The International Bureau of Education (IBE) was founded in 1929. It is now a part of UNESCO. It operates under statutes adopted by the UNESCO General Conference and under its own administrative rules and procedures. It is a policy making organization and center for educational information and studies. It has been described by experts as the only source of systematized data on educational organization, educational themes, problems and statistics from around the world. It is the only source of such data for Eastern Europe and Africa. The current director is an American. The United States cannot continue as a member of the Governing Body of IBE.

The International Education Information Network (INED) was established by the IBE in 1978. It is the beginning of a world wide network in education information. The United States is currently the largest contributor of information to INED. INED has an American director whose term expires in October 1985. The United States can no longer be a member of the INED governing board. The potential U.S. business interest of INED includes the hardware, software, communications equipment, and satellite communications sectors.

Concerns

The major concern expressed has been the loss of U.S. ability to affect the direction taken by the International Bureau of Education and the Network. It is expected that the American directors will be replaced,

---

*Prepared by Lois McHugh, Foreign Affairs Analyst

and the current strong American presence will be lost. Without a strong U.S. presence in the International Bureau of Education, and with Soviet influence, there is concern that activities of the Bureau, including the collection of statistics will be curtailed. A great concern is that the statistics will become less reliable and slower to be published. Reportedly, the Soviets have no interest in statistics. On the other hand, some experts doubt that the Soviet Assistant Director General will interfere at all with the Bureau. Others suggest that the World Bank also has education statistics which can provide much of the information needed by the United States.

In the Network, the major concern is that the U.S. role will be taken over by the Europeans and the Japanese. U.S. withdrawal from the governing board of the Network has been cited as the potentially most devastating long range loss by one expert. Management techniques and equipment currently provided by the United States will probably be replaced by European and Japanese source, some fear. There is no question that the network will exist, it is said, but it will have been created largely without U.S. influence. Others predict that if UNESCO cuts the Network budget because of U.S. withdrawal, the growth of the network will be slowed, and a few years without U.S. participation will have little effect.

In order to protect U.S. interests in the Network, it has been suggested that the United States work to separate the Network from the International Bureau of Education and that it be directed by a group of international educators. The U.S. would want to be part of any discus-

sion of such a plan.

Another concern is whether the United States will continue to participate in the gathering and publication of statistics for the International Bureau of Education. There is concern, first, that UNESCO will no longer ask for U.S. data, and second, that even if it does, the Department of Education will feel no obligation to provide the information. The statistics provided by the IBE are useful both to U.S. government analysts and private education experts. A spokesman for the Department of Education anticipated that the Department of Education would continue to provide statistics to UNESCO.

A third concern is that the United States will lose a good source of information on networking in other countries when it loses contact with the IBED governing board (Both Japan and Europe are more advanced than we in this area). Others anticipated that business and personal contacts can replace UNESCO.

Questions

1. Has UNESCO indicated interest in continuing to receive U.S. statistical information? Will the Department of Education be directed to continue to provide statistical information to UNESCO?

2. Will World Bank statistics be able to replace UNESCO statistics in the near future?

3. What plans does the United States have for maintaining U.S. interests in the International Bureau of Education and the IBED?

COMMUNICATIONS AND CULTURE

COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAMS*

Issue: Extent of damage to U.S. foreign policy, commercial, and other interests in communications-related activities caused by the U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO at the end of 1984.

Background:

UNESCO has played a central role in communications and information in the UN system. Its stated objective was improving understanding of the process of communication, encouraging the free flow of information, and strengthening communications infrastructures, especially in the Third World. During 1984 and 1985, UNESCO budgeted $16,156,000 for "regular" communications programs, or approximately $8 million per year.

During the period 1979-1983, [illegible] paid American consultants participated in 51 UNESCO communications projects. Partially because of the U.S. predominance in telecommunication hardware and software, such participation sometimes resulted in the selection of U.S. products and services, especially in building Third World communications networks. UNESCO expenditures of benefit to the United States included training fellowships in the U.S., procurement of U.S. communications equipment, and consultants' fees and payments to U.S. staff; by some estimates, this amounted to a significant percentage of the total U.S. contribution. Leonard Sussman of Freedom House recently pointed out that under UNESCO-sponsored marketing agreements, 70 governments lifted barriers to the import of various kinds of equipment; some $130 million in U.S. audiovisual equipment was exported in 1983 under such agreements. Other benefits from these programs were intangible and harder to measure.

---

* Prepared by Joel M. Woldman, Specialist in U.S. Foreign Policy.

(18)

UNESCO has given the United States an opportunity to debate communications issues in an international forum and to promote and defend U.S. (and Western) values and methods, primarily in the context of the decade-old Third World-backed (and Soviet-supported) demand for a New World Information and Communication Order (NWICO). NWICO is an attempt by non-Western countries to end what they claim is an excessive degree of Western influence -- "information imperialism" -- on international communications, in terms of both physical and content control of the media (access to and dissemination of information).

While many of the non-western members of UNESCO sought to redress this alleged imbalance through confrontational methods and attempts to assert a statist, controlled approach to the free flow of information, including normative codes for the media, the United States and its allies have tried to resolve the dispute in a more constructive way that offered concrete assistance to Third World states. The major expression of the U.S. approach had been the development of the semi-autonomous International Program for the Development of Communications (IPDC). The United States took the lead in launching the IPDC as a positive means of assisting Third World states to develop their own communications networks. Although this was not its primary objective, the IPDC also has meant additional business for U.S. exports and firms.

Concerns

Some communications industry officials concerned with international communications issues and their possible impact on the U.S. press and on the telecommunications industry were less than happy with the U.S. decision to withdraw from UNESCO, foreign policy considerations notwithstanding. Others felt they had been "had" by the U.S. Government because of alleged promises that the funds previously contributed to UNESCO would still be

available for similar programs conducted through alternative means. They now hope that they can find other alternative means of dealing with UNESCO, such as through participation in non-governmental organizations (NGOs) affiliated with the agency. Such groups include the International Federation of Newspaper Publishers, the International Press and Telecommunication Council, the World Press Freedom Committee, the Inter-American Press Association, the International Federation of Journalists, and the International Press Institute.

Some industry representatives noted that NWICO issues are surfacing in the Information Committee of the U.N. General Assembly. They hope that the NGOs, as well as U.S. representatives in the UNGA, will be able to assert U.S. interests in this continuing debate. Others are concerned that with the United States out of UNESCO, the organization will rush to embrace NWICO and make policy pronouncements alien to Western values. They also fear that dictatorial national leaders could then adopt anti-democratic communications policies and justify such steps because they have been endorsed in principle by UNESCO. Some observers also fear that with the United States out of UNESCO, adversaries could substitute technical standards unfavorable to U.S. companies.

Apparently some efforts were underway through such auspices as the State Department Office of International Communication and Information Policy to develop some alternative programs to promote U.S. telecommunications industry sales abroad using the funds freed by the withdrawal from UNESCO. But these plans have had to be substantially curtailed because of budgetary constraints. Plans for the establishment of a World Bank clearinghouse to make U.S. industry more aware of opportunities in the Third World have been dropped for lack of funds. The U.S. telecommunications industry tends not to solicit international business because it prefers to concentrate on the

more familiar U.S. domestic market. This, in turn, however, has a negative impact on the U.S. balance of trade problem.

A number of observers are undecided about the outcome of the withdrawal for U.S. foreign policy interests. While the majority feel the move was not sufficiently analyzed before it was taken, others feel that it is still too early only two months after withdrawal to assess the pluses and minuses. A number have suggested that the United States might be in a better position to know after a full year has passed. Still others feel that the United States has made its point and should now re-enter UNESCO and work more effectively for reform from within.

Questions

1. A number of analysts have voiced fears that, with the United States out of UNESCO, our adversaries and others who subscribe to non-democratic values might have an easier time of asserting their views in the organization. What do you think of these views? (Follow-up) Can you suggest any alternative means of making U.S. views on the free flow of information known in international forums dealing with communications issues?

2. Since the United States had taken the lead in implementing the non-confrontational International Program for the Development of Communications, is there any way that the U.S. can continue to play a positive role in this body and not lose the good will, not to mention the business opportunities we had developed prior to withdrawal? (Follow-up) Can't we continue to provide funds in the same magnitude that we did previously even though we no longer belong to UNESCO?

3. What kind of reaction have you had from the U.S. business community, especially the telecommunications hardware and software producers, and the international media and information producers -- press, wire services, television, publishers, data processors, etc. -- since the decision to withdraw from UNESCO? (Follow-up) How have you responded to their expressions of concern?

CULTURAL PROGRAMS

Issue: Extent of damage to U.S. foreign policy, commercial, and other interests in cultural-related activities caused by the U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO at the end of 1984.

Background:

UNESCO's cultural programs have focused on preserving the cultural and natural heritage of mankind, promoting various levels of cultural identity, stimulating artistic and cultural development, and promoting local cultural activities. During 1984 and 1985, UNESCO budgeted $25,554,300 for "regular" cultural programs or approximately $12.75 million per year.

The principal U.S. institutions involved in these programs have been the Smithsonian Institution, the U.S. Information Agency (USIA), the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the National Park Service. All six have previously allocated funds in support of UNESCO-related activities. For example, the Smithsonian Institution made large contributions to UNESCO's international efforts to preserve ancient historic monuments in Egypt and Pakistan. In addition, the National Park Service and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation have provided the principal American support for UNESCO's World Heritage Program. The Advisory Council has also selected American participants for the International Center for Conservation in Rome (ICCROM).

Between 1979 and 1983, some 45 percent of the 95 paid Americans recruited for the cultural sector worked on preservation and conservation activities, mostly in connection with museum-related projects in the Third World and in the World Heritage Program and efforts to preserve ancient monuments. Very few Americans have been involved in the cultural studies program. American

---

* Prepared by Joel M. Woldman, Specialist in U.S. Foreign Policy.

participation in the programs on stimulation of artistic creativity and cultural development only began in earnest in the late 1970s; some 20 Americans participated in these programs between 1979 and 1983. The National Endowment for the Arts was the major U.S. institution involved, although USIA and the National Endowment for the Humanities also participated.

The United States interacts with UNESCO differently than most other countries because of the predominantly private and independent nature of cultural activities in the U.S. We do not have a Ministry of Culture and this has created some structural obstacles to effective cooperation between the diffuse elements of the vast U.S. cultural scene and the more centralized cultural affairs structures in most other countries, to which UNESCO is better attuned.

In general, UNESCO's cultural programs have not been particularly controversial or politicized, in comparison with certain other activities. For example, the cultural heritage program was called "one of UNESCO's most positive achievements" by the Department of State. The United States has played an active role in the World Heritage Convention and was the first signatory (in 1973). U.S. museum circles have also supported UNESCO efforts to establish international norms of behavior for the exchange of cultural property.

The only problem areas in the cultural program have been repeated Arab efforts to inject the Arab-Israeli dispute into cultural preservation discussions and the possibility of a New World Cultural Order raised by the Second UNESCO Medium-Term Plan. The latter included a number of negative references to the cultural industries of North America and to the allegedly harmful impact of technology on individual cultures.

The National Park Service (part of the Department of the Interior) has been trying to maintain U.S. participation in the absence of UNESCO membership. The Secretary of the Interior has written to the Secretary of State indicating that this was a reasonable alternative if we left UNESCO. He also indicated that the U.S. voluntary contribution to the World Heritage Fund should continue at the FY85 level of c. $250,000.

The U.S. Government (Interior in cooperation with State) is honoring its obligations under three cultural heritage conventions separate from UNESCO, although their secretariats are staffed by UNESCO. It is unclear whether the State Department agrees with this, although it could be argued that the United States should continue to participate because of the international legal status of the conventions. Moreover, the U.S. contribution to the World Heritage Trust has always been separate from our contribution to UNESCO.

Concerns

Unlike certain other UNESCO program areas, the cultural program does not offer many commercial benefits for the United States. There is some commercial potential in the sales of books and other publications and in artists' fees, but these have not figured prominently in the discussion of pros and cons of UNESCO withdrawal. Outside the fields mentioned — cultural and historic preservation and the promotion of artistic creativity — the American cultural scene is primarily a private sector phenomenon. The cultural interaction of the United States with many countries is not managed by the Federal Government, except in the case of closed societies and Third World countries with vastly different cultural traditions or underdeveloped cultural infrastructures which

would not otherwise attract U.S. artistic or intellectual producers or products.

Nevertheless, activists in international cultural and historic preservation, museum affairs, and related fields generally supported U.S. participation in relevant UNESCO programs and are concerned at the message that U.S. withdrawal may convey to other countries. Because the United States apparently will continue to participate in certain cultural conventions and institutions, the cultural establishment has been somewhat less vocal in its criticism of the U.S. decision to withdraw.

As in the case of other UNESCO activities, however, the reaction has also been muted because of assurances by the State Department that the funds previously available for UNESCO projects would be provided for similar activities, but through other institutions. It remains to be seen what their reaction would be should the Department of State not restore funds previously available for UNESCO for [illegible]ive activities.

Questions

1. Do we, by our withdrawal from UNESCO, send a message to the other countries of the world that cultural matters are not worth fighting for?

2. Will the withdrawal from UNESCO have any effect on U.S. participation in the UNESCO Cultural Property Convention? (Follow-up) Won't the withdrawal make the United States ineligible to participate in the Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to Its Countries of Origin or Restitution in Case of Illicit Appropriation? (Follow-up) Since we have taken a leading part in such efforts, couldn't our non-participation lead to an increase in illegal seizures and thefts of cultural properties?

3. How will the U.S. be able to react effectively against attacks on U.S. cultural values in UNESCO forums?

FUNDING FOR UNESCO SCIENCE*

Issue: The United States has withdrawn from UNESCO, but is seeking an appropriation to support UNESCO science activities in the U.S. interest of $2.2 million, via primarily funds-in-trust arrangements. 1/ This level of funding may not be adequate to maintain U.S. activities and may be politically unacceptable to other UNESCO members. On the other hand, the superiority of U.S. science may prevent major short- and long-term negative impacts on U.S. and UNESCO international science activities.

Background

The last annual U.S. contribution to UNESCO totaled about $30 million; about 28 percent, or $14 million, went to support natural sciences programs. 2/ UNESCO's science programs are budgeted at about $70 million for 1984 and 1985, about one-half of the operating budget for science, since UNESCO science activities are supported by other sources, such as the U.N. Development Program (UNDP), the U.N. Environmental Program (UNEP), and voluntary contributions.

In July 1984 the Department of State evaluated the UNESCO science programs and identified areas that should be given priority attention or that should be reformed or terminated. 3/ The priority areas are those same programs for which the Department is seeking support for 1986.

---

* Prepared by Genevieve J. Knezo, Specialist in Science and Technology

1/ U. S. International Development Cooperation Agency. Congressional Presentation, Fiscal Year 1986, pp. 32-34.

2/ UNESCO Science Programs: Impacts of U.S. Withdrawal and Suggestions for Alternative Interim Arrangements: A Preliminary Assessment. By Office of International Affairs, National Research Council, Washington, National Academy Press, 1984, 58 p. plus appendices, also published in U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Science and Technology. Subcommittees on Natural Resources, Agriculture Research, and Environment and on Science, Research and Technology. Impact on U.S. Scientific Research of Proposal to Withdraw From UNESCO. Hearings, Mar. 8 and 15, 1984, 98th Congress, 2nd session. Washington, U.S. G.P.O. The page numbers referred herein to the NAS report are those as published in the hearing record.

3/ Letter from U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to UNESCO Director-General, July 13, 1984, pp. 27-31.

In 1984, Gregory Newell, Assistant Secretary of State, was reported to have said that if budget exigencies allowed, the Government would attempt to allocate to U.S. agencies or UNESCO-run programs, the approximately $50 million that would have gone to UNESCO to fund similar kinds of programs. 4 / The National Academy of Sciences (NAS) recommended alternative alternative funding and organizational arrangements to continue U.S. participation directly in priority UNESCO science activities, 5 / even though the NAS concluded that "there is at present no viable overall alternative for UNESCO's science programs." 6 /

A summary of the Department's request for UNESCO science programs, together with funding levels recommended by NAS, and the U.S. share of the 1984-1985 UNESCO budget allocation, if available, follows: 7 /

Program	State	NAS	U.S/UNESCO
International Oceanographic Commission (IOC)	$500k	$2.5 m	$2.2m
International Geological Correlation Program (IGCP) and Natural Hazards Program	$300k	$2m	$1.3m
International Hydrological Program (IHP)	$300k	$1 m	$1.1m
Man and the Biosphere (MAB)	$500k	$2 m	$1.85m
Non-governmental Research Organizations and International Cooperative Research	$450k	$1.8m	$4.3m

---

4 / An UN Quits UNESCO, Concerns Rise About Global Science. Physics Today, Feb. 1985: 53-55.

5 / NAS. UNESCO Science Programs, op. cit. The report amplified upon critiques and priority determination exercises prepared by the agencies and the Department of State. An early interagency report is: U.S. National Science Foundation, Natural Sciences in UNESCO, A U.S. Interagency Perspective, Oct. 21, 1983, published in Impact on U.S. Scientific Research of Proposal to Withdraw From UNESCO, Hearings, op. cit.; Department of State reviews include: U.S./UNESCO Policy Review, op. cit.; Letter, July 13, 1984, op. cit., and Department of State, "Wish List," draft, Oct. 1984.

6 / NAS. UNESCO Science Programs, op. cit., p. 171. See also An UN Quits UNESCO, Concerns Rise About Global Science, op. cit., p. 53. Interview, Walter A. Rosenblith, foreign secretary, NAS, Feb. 26, 1985.

7 / U.S. International Development Cooperation Agency. Congressional Presentation Fiscal Year 1986, pp. 32-34 and NAS. UNESCO Science Programs, 174-176.

Questions

1. Is the $2.2. million the United States is seeking to support UNESCO science large enough to maintain useful science activities and to support U.S. claims that it should participate in UNESCO science?

2. The Department apparently wants to target the requested support to selected UNESCO activities. Will other countries accept the terms attached to these potential contributions?

3. Will the Department of State allocate the personnel resources to manage the line-item funding, and will U.S. agencies, which participate directly in UNESCO programs or indirectly in them via support roles to nongovernmental organizations, be given the resources to backstop these activities?

IMPACT ON U.S. PARTICIPATION IN UNESCO PROGRAMS*

Issue: The United States may be able to retain membership in the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC), but apparently will forfeit membership and decisionmaking authority for all other UNESCO science programs, thereby, making it difficult to improve UNESCO from within.

Background

Apparently neither the State Department nor UNESCO have fully assessed the specific implications of U.S. withdrawal. The NAS report, however, summed up the likely impacts on U.S. participation, consisting primarily of a diminution of U.S. influence on the UNESCO secretariat, governing boards, and the governing boards of affiliated international nongovernmental scientific organizations:

> With the possible exception of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission and, to a less certain degree the International Geological Correlation Program, the United States will forfeit the right to participate in the governance of major UNESCO-sponsored cooperative international programs upon withdrawal. Only limited influence can be exerted on the directions of these programs through U.S. participation in the cooperating NGOs. It is important to note. . . . the role played by UNESCO staff in planning, advising, and implementing major programs supported from other sources (e.g., UNDP, UNEP, Funds-in-trust), Withdrawal may seriously affect possibilities for American participation in program management roles as UNESCO staff members. 1/

The United States has, or probably will, lose its membership on the governing boards of the Man in the Biosphere Program (MAB), the International Hydrological Program (IHP), and the International Geological Correlation Program (IGCP). However, the United States says it can retain membership on the International Oceanographic Commission (IOC). 2/ Brazil and the Soviet Union have

---

* Prepared by Genevieve J. Knezo, Specialist in Science and Technology

1/ NAS. UNESCO Science Programs, op. cit., p. 169.

2/ Interviews: Philip Hamily, Consultant, Feb. 22, 1985; Bill Long, Department of State, Feb. 23, 1985; Dalla Laura, U.S. Geological Survey, Feb. 20, 1985; and John Reinemund, U. S. Geological Survey, Feb. 25, 1985.

45-190 O - 85 - 3

challenged, unsuccessfully, continued U.S. participation on the IOC board, and are likely to renew the challenge in the forthcoming March 1985 IOC Assembly meeting. Brazil charges that the United States is not paying its "fair share" allocation, which others in government have estimated to be $1 million, and which the NAS estimates at $2.5 million. 3/

Question

1. How can the United States reform UNESCO, or ensure that U.S. contributions for science are spent as it wishes since it has to relinquish its membership on the governing bodies of the science activities?

3/ NAS. UNESCO Science Programs, op. cit., p. 182, and Interview, Dorothy Borgamaschi, Department of State, Feb. 26, 1985.

IMPACTS ON FOREIGN POLICY*

Issue: The major impact on foreign policy appears to be the perception, especially among the LDCS, that the United States is an unreliable partner, not interested in technical assistance. In the long-run the Soviets may attempt to dominate science planning; this will be mitigated by the attractiveness and excellence of cooperation with U.S. scientists. U.S. scientists may find it difficult to obtain access to foreign sites if they are no longer covered by the intergovernmental agreements concluded by UNESCO.

Background

There appears to be no clearcut evidence that the Soviets will fill the void in science planning and programmatic activities left by the withdrawal of the United States, at least in the short-run. However, the Soviet Union has challenged U.S. claims that it can continue to participate in some UNESCO activities and sit as a member of governing boards by virtue of funds-in-trust contributions.

Another major impact on foreign policy might be the reactions of the LDCs, which, having been promised continued U.S. support for UNESCO-related science activities totaling $14 million, might consider no funding (should Congress zero out the request) or symbolic funding (since it totals only $2.2 million for science) another indication of U.S. lack of concern for the developing countries. 1/

According to the State Department, "the decrease in income from dues would damage UNESCO's ability to meet the U.S. objective of assistance to LDCs . . . in developing scientific capabilities and infrastructure, and to perform the successful international scientific projects which UNESCO has sponsored." 2/ However, there is also the view that UNESCO was

* Prepared by Genevieve J. Knezo, Specialist in Science and Technology

1/ Interview, Walter Rosenblith, Feb. 26, 1985.

2/ U.S./UNESCO Policy Review, op. cit.

never intended to serve primarily the science and technology infrastructure of developing countries. 3/

The foreign policy impacts of withdrawal may be more important in the long term. U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO development-oriented science work may widen perceptions of U.S. distaste for multilateral development assistance, with likely foreign policy consequences. In addition, according to NAS foreign secretary Walter Rosenblith, who is also vice president of the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU), whose programs will be cut about one-third because of U.S. withdrawal, a cutback on funding for UNESCO demonstrates to the rest of the world that the United States is an unreliable and almost selfish, chauvinistic partner when it comes to international science cooperation. This perception may be exacerbated since the fiscal year 1986 National Science Foundation (NSF) budget requested only $700,000 for U.S. international organization cooperative science programs, a cut of $400,000 from fiscal year 1985. 4/ This does not give NSF an ability to pick up the slack to support UNESCO international organizations programs.

A major function UNESCO provides is the umbrella of an intergovernmental organization which concludes agreements to permit scientists free and ready access to relevant research sites and data in other countries. Without such an intergovernmental umbrella, governments might have to enter into hundreds of separate bilateral agreements with all countries concerned in order to

3/ NAS. UNESCO Science Programs, op. cit., p. 160. See also: Knezo, Genevieve J. and Michael E. Davey. Science and Technology Programs in UNESCO: A Description of the Programs and Preliminary Analysis of the Policy Implications of U.S. Withdrawal for Science. Report prepared at the request of the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology, House Committee on Science and Technology by the Science Policy Research Division, Congressional Research Service, Mar. 12, 1984, printed in Impact on U.S. Scientific Research of Proposal to Withdraw from UNESCO, Hearings, pp. 141-142.

4/ Interview, Feb. 26, 1985.

continue the kinds of activities sanctioned by the intergovernmental agreements reached by UNESCO. 5 /

Questions

1. Does the United States object to the technical assistance oriented science activities in UNESCO?

2. What steps is the United States taking to make arrangements with other countries to provide access for American scientists to research sites in other countries, now that the United States may no longer be covered by the intergovernmental agreements enforced by UNESCO?

---

5 / U.S/ UNESCO Policy Review, Department of State, typescript, Feb. 27, 1985, p. 12.

IMPACTS ON U.S. BUSINESS*

Issue: It does not appear as if U.S. business sales will suffer immediate serious consequences as a result of withdrawal from UNESCO science. This may change in the long run.

Background

There does not appear to be clear evidence that withdrawal from UNESCO science activities would ultimately harm U.S. business in any tangible sense. (The effect of withdrawal from UNESCO information programs which are related but separate would be more direct. That issue is considered separately.)

Some experts contend that sales of U.S. equipment and consulting services abroad may be hurt because foreign scientists if they lose contacts with Americans, will receive less exposure to American equipment, and will contract with experts in other countries. This will reduce American participation markets abroad and foreign competitors will fill the void. 1/ According to Dalia Laura, a U.S. Geological Survey staff member working with the International Hydrological Program (IHP), limiting exposure of U.S. hydrologists to their colleagues, via UNESCO, in other countries will have a significant negative impact on the ability of American business to open new markets abroad. To overcome this problem, she suggested the alternative funding arrangement of the Department of State providing funding, totaling about $1 million, directly to the U.S. Geological Survey, to administer international water programs directly, rather than going through

---

* Prepared by Genevieve J. Knezo, Specialist in Science and Technology

1/ See, for example, Weber, Nathan. UNESCO. Who Needs It. Across The Board, v. 21, Sept. 1984: 11-17.

UNESCO or the ICSU. 2 / Apparently, the cutbacks in the International Geological Correlation Program may cause potential losses of data that would have been made available to U.S. industry, but the International Union of Geological Sciences, the NGO affiliated with the program, has not yet fully explored the potential for increased private sector funding of these activities. 3 /

Problems of this nature may be exacerbated because UNESCO administers programs for the U.N. Development Program, " [that] provides between 6,000 and 7,000 experts to developing countries, 5,000 fellowships for advanced study abroad, equipment ranging from computers to hand tools, and various technical services." It has been estimated that UNESCO, using its own funds, and U.N.D.P. funds, purchases about $115 million to $120 million worth of equipment and material annually. 4 / Without U.S. participation, buyers may seek equipment elsewhere.

The validity of this contention necessarily is related to the perception of the quality of U.S. science and problem solving. As long as U.S. science and technology are perceived as superior and capable of providing technical solutions to problems in other countries, much of U.S. foreign business will not suffer. Another relevant point is that apparently UNESCO has determined that no sanctions will be levied against individual Americans, who can continue to serve as contractors or experts on any individual UNESCO science activity.

Another kind of financial loss has been discussed. According to A. K. Solomon, Professor of Biophysics Emeritus at the Harvard Medical School,

---

2 / Interview, Feb. 20, 1985.

3 / Interview, John Rainemund, Feb. 22, 1985.

4 / Weber, op. cit., pp. 17 and 18.

. . . . [O]f the $46 million the United States contributed to UNESCO last year, 40 percent will be eventually returned to the American economy as tuition to American universities from UNESCO-sponsored fellows, payment to U.S. consulting firms from UNESCO projects, and so forth. 5 /

Another issue, as yet unresolved, may be more important. UNESCO administers several intergovernmental agreements that promote international business since they "remove barriers to the importation and circulation of books, works of art, magazines, films, film equipment, tapes, scientific instruments, devices used to test industrial materials, and so forth." These are the Beirut and Florence Agreements, and the Nairobi Protocol to the Florence Agreement, by which the 71 signatory countries have agreed to the removal of duties, licenses, taxes, and other obstacles to the sale and distribution of such materials. American audiovisual, scientific information, and other companies may lose sales if U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO causes prohibitions against the distribution of U.S. material in other countries. It has been estimated that loss of sales of audiovisual equipment alone, may total $130 million. 6 /

The $2.75 million line item requested by the Department of State for trust fund contributions to UNESCO activities in the U.S. interest includes $100,000 to pay overhead costs to administer these and related conventions.

Question

1. Just what are the estimated losses to American business of cutbacks in support for UNESCO science activities?

---

5 / Solomon, A. K. Science Unlimited. The New Republic, Dec. 31, 1984, v. 191: 10.

6 / Weber, op. cit. p. 13.

EFFECTS ON RESEARCH AND INFORMATION EXCHANGE*

Issue: Immediate, and even long-term, negative impacts on U.S. science stemming from cutbacks in support for UNESCO may be mitigated by the desire of foreign scientists to benefit from the excellence of U.S. science. Short-term impacts on U.S. science may not be serious. Long-term impacts involve withdrawal from intergovernmental agreements permitting access to foreign research sites.

Background

The Department of State concluded that U.S. withdrawal would cause significant reductions in the direct access of the U.S. scientific community to important data bases, localities, and scientific resources worldwide, and withdrawal would make it difficult to continue scientific exchanges with countries with which we now have limited political relations. 1/ This conclusion may be true, but it needs to be put in perspective.

The $14 million that consisted of the U.S. share of contributions to UNESCO's science programs prior to withdrawal, and the $2.2 million that the Department is now seeking to support U.S. science interests is a miniscule sum in comparison with the total FY 1986 budget request for basic research, at $8 billion. Therefore, why not enlarge science funding to UNESCO, since it would be such a small portion of the overall basic research budget? On the other hand, if the UNESCO programs are so small, other U.S. scientific programs, funded out of that $8 billion budget, may serve as adequate replacements for the UNESCO activities. Another alternative is for federal agencies to fund needed international research from their own budgets. Regardless of speculations of this nature, the most readily apparent implication of withdrawal for U.S. science is that UNESCO, being an intergovernmental body, serves the crucial role of facilitating access of American scientists to sites in other

---

*Prepared by Genevieve J. Knezo, Specialist in Science and Technology

1/ U.S./UNESCO Policy Review, op. cit.

countries and that a multilateral mechanism is a more felicitous, cheaper, and more expedient way to secure access than hundreds, or possibly thousands of bilateral agreements.

The consensus of our interviews seems to be that the short-term impacts of withdrawal on science appear to be minimal. There are some exceptions. According to Brian Payne, of the Forest Service, who works on the Man in the Biosphere program (MAB), raw data about biosphere reserves has been collected, but not analyzed. A cut in funding might preclude data analysis and curtail access of U.S. scientists to data gathered by other countries. 2 / The MAB biosphere reserve monitoring program may also be cut. 3 / John Reinemund, U.S. Geological Survey, said that the funding cut for the International Geological Correlation Program, coming on the heels of cutbacks in U.S. AID support for geology in other countries, may seriously jeopardize scientific research. 4/ With respect to international organizations and support for ICSU, short-run impacts do not appear serious, since there is sufficient momentum and money obligated to support the participation of U.S. scientists in the short term. However, U.S. scientists may lose their governing positions on the ICSU member unions' steering committees in the long-run. 5 / A serious potential problem may arise if the United States is not allowed to participate in future IOC activities, since it has been estimated that it would cost the U.S. Navy $2 billion per year to gather data now gathered by other nations on subsurface ocean temperatures and salt content, if the Navy had to use its own ships to

---

2 / Interview, Feb. 22, 1985.

3 / Interview, Bill Long, Office of Food and Natural Resources, Department of State, Feb. 25, 1985.

4 / Interview, John Reinemund, Feb. 22, 1985.

5 / Interview, Walter A. Rosenblith, Feb. 26, 1985.

gather the data. 6 /

There seems to be agreement that the United States must make firm alternative funding arrangements to participate in UNESCO science in order to sustain foreign receptivity for American participation in UNESCO activities. 7 / Apparently some UNESCO members have already objected to the terms attached to trust-in-funds contributions because they say only UNESCO members should participate in UNESCO projects. This position may be mitigated if scientists from other countries find other access points to American science.

Some of the difficulties with UNESCO science have been attributed to U.S. Government inaction, specifically, lack of attention to UNESCO science, poor coordination of U.S. policy and planning for international science activities, and secondment of unqualified Americans to the UNESCO secretariat. In fact, Dr. Rosenblith said that one potential benefit of withdrawal is the likely reassessment the U.S. government will give to restructuring programs and policies for international science. 8 /

Questions

1. Is the superiority of U.S. science so great as to compel scientists in other countries to seek out U.S. scientists for cooperative work regardless of our withdrawal from UNESCO?

2. What is the Department of State doing to meet the NAS recommendations to improve the U.S. government organizational apparatus to support U.S. international science policies?

3. Should the State Department allocate funds directly to agencies interested in UNESCO's international science programs so that they can support the programs directly, via contributions to the adhering NGOs?

4. What steps is UNESCO taking to improve the management of its science programs?

---

6 / Interview, Philip Hemily, consultant, Feb. 22, 1985.

7 / Interview, Rosenblith, op. cit., and NAS, op. cit., p. 169.

8 / U.S./UNESCO Policy Review, op. cit., pp. 13-14. See also: MacKenzie, Debora. UNESCO: Science That Should Be Saved. New Scientist, v. 104, Nov. 22, 1984: 8-9. Interview, Feb. 26, 1984; and Physics Today, op. cit.: 55.

SCIENCE EDUCATION*

Issue: What will be the impact on precollege science education programs within UNESCO as a result of the United States withdrawal?

Background

UNESCO's programs for improving the teaching of precollege science and the dissemination of information on curriculum development related to science and technology falls under Program V.2 entitled, Teaching of Science and Technology. The program for Teaching Science and Technology is composed of two major subprograms, the Development of School and Out-of-School Teaching of Science and Technology and the Dissemination of Scientific and Technological Knowledge.

The aim of the Development of School and Out-of-School Teaching of Science and Technology subprogram is to promote the improvement and the modernization of science and technology teaching, keeping in mind the individual nation's development needs. The projects within this subprogram are designed to place particular emphasis on the promotion of experimentation, innovation, and research at the precollege level. The results of these activities are used to update both the curriculum content and teacher-training programs for the teaching of science and technology around the world.

The primary goal of the Dissemination of Scientific and Technological Knowledge subprogram is to make scientific and technological knowledge available to the general public, especially in less developed countries (LDCs) and to promote out-of-school scientific activities for young people. This program emphasizes improving the circulation of information on new curriculum development, and methods and materials for the teaching of precollege science and technology within developing countries.

---

* Prepared by Michael E. Davey, Analyst in Science and Technology

The following table provides information on the budget for the teaching of Science and Technology.

Teaching of Science and Technology 1/

Regular Program	$6,069,800
United Nation's Sources	$1,120,000
Other Programs	$3,715,000
Total	$10,904,800

Concerns 2/

1. Will the withdrawal of the United States reduce the level of Western influence in UNESCO's precollege science education programs?

Americans have had a considerable level of influence on UNESCO's precollege science education programs. In fact, UNESCO's science education program was established and directed by an American scientist, who was interviewed for this report. The science education programs have continued to have strong American participation and have established significant links with the National Academy of Sciences, the University of Maryland's International Science Education Clearinghouse, and until the recent past the National Science Foundation. Further, the United States was instrumental in establishing the Committee on the Teaching of Science, (CTS) within the Internation Council of Scientific Unions, (ICSU). The CTS and ICSU's various Scientific Unions have played a major role in developing UNESCO's precollege science and technology programs. Consequently, U.S. scientific educators have developed strong partnerships with Ministries of Education in less developed countries. For example, a UNESCO published

---

1/ Approved Programme and Budget for 1984-1985. UNESCO Paris. Jan. 1984. p. 196.

2/ The following discussion regarding U.S. areas of concern for science education was developed through phone conversations with several U.S. citizens, who have had extensive involvement with UNESCO's precollege science and technology programs since their inception. Additional comments were derived from a Department of State U.S./UNESCO Policy Review, dated Feb. 27, 1984.

book, Sources for Science Educators, written by an American, has sold over 1,000,000 copies, and been translated into 28 languages, the latest being Chinese. This book has not been updated since 1973, and the American author now believes that he will not be given the opportunity to update this publication.

All of the scientific educators interviewed believe that the U.S withdrawal will sever most of their long-standing professional relationships with UNESCO member nations, especially in the less developed countries. One American science educator pointed out that this is already happening. He noted that for the first time, he had not been invited to the annual meeting of the International Council of Associations for Science Educators, (ICASE), although he was the first President of the Association.

The science educators felt that the loss of Americans in key decision making positions within UNESCO's science education programs, will further reduce the development of materials and methods for teaching science and technology that contain a Western perspective and values.

Some of the scientists interviewed believed that the British or the Australians, who have been very active in UNESCO's precollege science activities, could continue to provide a Western perspective within the various programs. However, recent statements by the British Government, regarding their future involvement with UNESCO may have damaged British stature in UNESCO.

2. Are there alternative approaches that the U.S. could utilize in order to continue its involvement in international precollege science education programs?

Because of the various capacities in which Americans have served in the precollege science programs, from director of the Science Education Program to field consultant, all of the scientific educators stated that it would be

extremely difficult to develop an effective alternative to UNESCO. They cited the fact that the currently proposed Department of State budget contains no money for precollege science education.

In their study of UNESCO, the Department of State contends that even after leaving UNESCO, the United States could continue to support international precollege activities. For example, the United States could explore the possibility of providing conditional grants or funds-in-trust to UNESCO subsidiary organs, such as the International Bureau of Education (Geneva), the International Institute of Educational Planning (Paris), and perhaps the European Center for Higher Education (Bucharest).

The Department of State indicated that the United States could increase funding of bilateral education assistance in such organizations as AID, USIA, and the Peace Corps, or increase U.S. participation in the activities of regional governmental bodies such as the Organization of American States.

Finally, the Department recognized that non-governmental organizations, such as ICSU, with official affiliation with UNESCO might provide a suitable alternative for continuing precollege science education programs.

However, the science educators interviewed indicated that some of these alternatives would not be nearly as effective as UNESCO and, in some cases, just not realistic. For example, although ICSU and its various scientific unions often have been mentioned as a potential alternative to UNESCO, ICSU is extremely understaffed and would need much greater funding than the $1.5 million it currently receives from the United States. Finally, one scientist pointed out that most of ICSU's educational programs are aimed at the college level.

Although each of the science educators indicated that bilateral educational assistance by AID, USIA, or the Peace Corps is a possibility, such mechanisms

present some difficulties. First, in many instances, bilateral assistance would be seen by many as an extension of U.S. foreign policy. Thus, such aid would come with "strings" subject to the change in political philosophy in Washington. The scientists indicated that they were always viewed as representatives of UNESCO, not as representatives of the United States Government. Second, bilateral programs do not allow for the effective communication of program developments within other non-participating LDCs as in a 160 member organization, such as UNESCO. Finally, some scientists indicated that bilateral aid through an organization such as AID is often slow and very cumbersome to get in place.

3. Will the Soviet Union attempt to fill the void left by the Americans in the area of science education?

Without exception, all of the science educators felt that the Soviet Union and its allies would move quickly to fill the void left by the United States. Currently, the Assistant Director General for Education is a Soviet, while the director of UNESCO's Science Education programs is from Afghanistan. The scientists also indicated that without U.S. participation in UNESCO, there is very little that the United States could do to contain the influence of the Soviets and their allies.

The Department of State supported this contention when they noted in their report that " western interests in education would be more weakly defended with the United States absent." 3/ Further, the report continued by noting that withdrawal would put the United States in a poor position to encourage UNESCO science education programs that parallel U.S. interests.

3/ U.S./UNESCO Policy Review, Department of State, Feb. 27, 1984 p. 8.

4. How might American business be affected by the withdrawal of the United States from UNESCO's science education programs?

According to the science educators, the primary loss for American business will be in the area of purchasing scientific equipment. Obviously scientific equipment is needed in order to teach science education courses and to conduct field experiments. Currently the United States has the reputation of providing some of the best scientific equipment in the various UNESCO programs. UNESCO has not stated that member states should not purchase equipment from non-member states. Nevertheless, the scientists interviewed indicated that member states are encourage by UNESCO to purchase equipment and other supplies from other member states, whenever possible.

Several of the science educators that were interviewed said that the Japanese and the Soviets would try to take advantage of the U.S. absence. However, UNESCO countries may have to order equipment from the United States, because in some instances, the United States is the only country where the equipment can be purchased.

5. Will the U.S. withdrawal be seen as a reduced commitment to the problems of the less developed countries?

The scientists interviewed believe that the U.S. withdrawal will be seen by the LDCs as another sign of U.S. insensitivity to the problems of the third world. They also noted that the U.S. withdrawal will block its participation in some new science education programs under the sponsorship of UNESCO. Specifically, two of the science educators indicated that they had been involved in a UNESCO sponsored program to help with the restructuring of China's K-12 science education program. However, now that the United States has left UNESCO, both scientists believe they will not be invited to return.

The Department of State believes that continued U.S. participation through bilateral arrangements or by providing conditional grants or funds-in-trust to the LDCs, will demonstrate U.S. sensitivity to the problems of the LDCs.

Questions

1. In your report entitled U.S./UNESCO Policy Review, the Department of State indicated that UNESCO's precollege science education program was one of the most successful UNESCO sponsored programs. Why then has the State Department not provided any funds to help with the continuation of U.S. involvement in this area?

2. The Department of State has recommended ICSU as one potential alternative for continuing U.S. participation in precollege science education. Has the Department of State actually discussed this possibility with ICSU? If so, what was their reaction?

3. Is it the State Department's belief that U.S. science educators will be invited to participate in UNESCO sponsored projects and meetings?

4. What specific efforts has the Department of State initiated in order to maintain U.S. involvement in international precollege science education?

5. Has the Department of State met with U.S. science educators, who have been involved with UNESCO, to obtain their suggestions regarding potential alternatives to UNESCO? If so, what were some of their suggestions?

6. In your report you recommended using bilateral arrangements through such agencies as AID, USIA, and the Peace Corps. What specific arrangements have these agencies made in order to begin carrying out this recommendation?

SOCIAL SCIENCES, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND WOMEN'S ISSUES

SOCIAL SCIENCE PROGRAMS*

Issue: Damage to the development of social science knowledge, and to the international exchange of ideas and information; particular damage to exchanges with social scientists from Africa, Asia, and Latin America; consequent harm to the United States.

Background

UNESCO programs related to the development and exchange of ideas and information in the social sciences include:

Program number	Title	Proposed regular UNESCO expenditure 1984 and 1985 (S)
I	Reflection on world problems and future oriented studies	2,729,200
VI.4	Research, training, and international cooperation in the social sciences	8,031,700
VI.5	Research, training, and regional and international cooperation in some key areas in the social and human sciences	1,418,100
VIII.1	Study and planning of development	4,100,800
IX.1	Study and improvement of the relationship between science, technology, and society	2,628,700
XII	Elimination of prejudice, intolerance, racism, and apartheid	1,629,800
XIII	Peace, understanding, human rights and the rights of peoples	5,340,300
XIV	The status of women	4,791,000
Total		26,078,100

* Prepared by Raymond W. Copson, Specialist in International Relations.

The inclusion of particular programs in this list might be questioned. Programs I and IX.1, for example, are multidisciplinary and not strictly social science -- although social science concerns are prominent in the program descriptions. Nonetheless, as a rough estimate, it appears that UNESCO was planning to spend more than $10 million per year in the social sciences in 1984 and 1985. What its expenditures will be in the wake of the U.S. withdrawal is uncertain.

The various UNESCO social science programs typically fund studies and surveys, training activities, travel grants, and international meetings. Program VI.4 supports the International Social Science Council (ISSC), which is intended to be a worldwide social science coordinating body, as well as a number of other social science organizations. This same program provides funds to strengthen social science organizations in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Some programs support efforts to collect and publish data in the social sciences, and UNESCO publishes the International Social Science Journal (ISSJ), which attracts contributions from around the world.

According to information provided by UNESCO, 29 Americans published articles in ISSJ during the years 1979 through 1983. Many American social scientists have attended UNESCO-sponsored meetings, symposiums, and round-tables; authored studies on UNESCO grants; or carried out research on UNESCO contracts. The exact number of U.S. social scientists involved in these activities is uncertain, but would appear to lie between 60 and 100 for 1979-1983. At the end of 1984, 15 scholars sponsored by UNESCO were reportedly pursuing studies in social science at U.S. institutions.

Concerns

Social scientists who have been involved in UNESCO programs are concerned that the U.S. withdrawal will weaken UNESCO programs by reducing

funding. This could affect the development of new knowledge in the social sciences and cut back on the international exchange of social science ideas and information. Those who hold this view typically acknowledge that social science would continue to thrive in the developed nations, even in the absence of UNESCO programs. But social science scholarship and training in the Third World, where well-qualified social scientists are already at work and where significant new perspectives on social science issues are being developed, could be harmed. UNESCO training programs, sponsorship of regional social science organizations, and support for travel by Third World scholars to international social-science meetings, have been cited as particularly useful activities that could suffer in UNESCO budget reductions.

UNESCO programs offer an unusual opportunity for U.S. social scientists to interact with Third World scholars and to carry out research in less developed areas. Many are concerned that these opportunities will be lost or reduced as a result of the U.S. withdrawal. Some cite the suspicion often encountered by U.S. researchers in Third World nations, and suggest that UNESCO credentials have been useful in the past in allowing U.S. scholars to carry on their work.

The potential loss of U.S. access to UNESCO programs could have an adverse impact on U.S. knowledge about the Third World, and its perspectives and concerns, according to some social scientists. The quality of teaching on Third World issues at U.S. colleges and universities, as well as the quality of research by U.S. scholars, has been enhanced through UNESCO, many believe. From their perspective, any reduction in knowledge about the Third World could eventually reduce the effectiveness of U.S. foreign policy on Third World issues.

An alternative point of view, however, is that the U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO will do little harm to social science knowledge or to the United States. The U.S. social science community, some note, is very large, and only a small portion of its members have had any involvement with UNESCO programs. Social science research, even on Third World issues, can be expected to continue largely unimpeded despite the withdrawal. Some critics maintain that UNESCO social science activities are not well-planned or well-managed, and that many are concerned with Third World issues of little relevance to mainstream social science in the United States. Studies and programs oriented toward promoting a "new international economic order" have come in for special criticism. Moreover, some maintain, UNESCO's work is too focused on "microprojects," or individual studies and meetings, rather than on rigorous large-scale efforts of truly global importance. Critics also suggest that the UNESCO social science journal is not widely read and may not maintain adequate standards of review for the manuscripts it publishes.

Questions

1. Only a small proportion of the social science community in the United States appears to have had any direct involvement in UNESCO-sponsored programs. Why is this? Would you say that the fault lies with UNESCO or with the U.S. agencies and organizations responsible for liaison with UNESCO?

2. If the United States were to return to UNESCO, what reforms would you work for in the organization's social science programs? In your view, was UNESCO making progress in realizing these reforms before the United States withdrew?

3. UNESCO's social science programs have been criticized as excessively oriented toward Third World issues and concerns. Supporters of the organization, however, have said that it provides a valuable forum for airing Third World opinions and perspectives. What is your view?

4. To your knowledge, have there been any actions to date on the part of UNESCO that would deny involvement by U.S. social scientists in UNESCO activities?

5. Do you expect that recipients of UNESCO fellowships will continue to be allowed to use these fellowships at U.S. institutions?

UNESCO: Social Science Development*

Issue. Possible damage to the development of the social science disciplines in Africa, Asia, and Latin America; potential alienation of Third World social science from U.S. social science.

Background

Several UNESCO activities that strengthen the social sciences in Africa, Asia, and Latin America are carried out under Program VI.4, "Research, Training, and International Cooperation in the Social and Human Sciences." These activities include direct support for post-graduate study on the part of Third World students; funding to strengthen Third World academic and research institutions; strengthening of regional social science organizations in the Third World; and support for Third World scholars attending international social science meetings. Program VIII.1, "Study and Planning of Development," is aimed at enhancing knowledge of factors involved in development, and thus seeks to support a social science of special importance for the Third World nations. Other social science programs, not specifically aimed at the less developed areas, may support research, training, and travel of benefit to those areas.

Concerns

Supporters of UNESCO's social science development efforts believe that the social science profession as a whole benefits from the new data, ideas, and approaches generated by the expansion of the disciplines. Moreover, knowledge of Africa, Asia, and Latin America has probably increased as a result of this expansion, it is argued, strengthening the

* Prepared by Raymond W. Copson, Specialist in International Relations.

ability of the United States to develop appropriate policies for the Third World.

Perhaps more important, some maintain, is the influence U.S. social science may have acquired in the Third World as a result of UNESCO's efforts. Social science is a highly developed profession in the United States, and the advanced concepts and methodologies developed here must inevitably influence those who enter the profession in other countries. Those who make this point see U.S. social science as "pluralistic" in its approach, and opposed to single-factor Marxist-oriented explanations of social issues. Moreover, U.S. social science is perceived as more balanced and objective than Marxist approaches -- and more likely to persuade Third World social scientists to keep an open mind on social science questions. Consequently, while it may be true that many Third World social scientists are critical of the United States and its policies, the long-term influence of an expansion of social science in the Third World is likely to benefit the United States -- for those who hold this point of view.

A counterview is that UNESCO social science programs have fostered ideas and concepts, such as those related to the proposed "New International Economic Order," which tend to place the blame for social problems in the Third World on the developed nations, and particularly the United States. Moreover, it is argued, such UNESCO-sponsored work on apartheid in South Africa and on disarmament is unfairly critical of the United States. Thus, from this point of view, the United States has little to lose from any weakening of UNESCO social science programs.

In any event, some assert, the U.S. social science discipline is so large and so developed, that its concepts and methodologies will remain

influential even in the absence of any UNESCO program. Third World scholars will continue to come to the United States for training, to read and contribute to U.S. social science journals, and to welcome U.S. social scientists at their universities and research institutions.

Questions

1. To your knowledge, has UNESCO taken any action, or is it contemplating action, that will restrict U.S. participation in programs aimed at strengthening social science in the Third World nations? Will UNESCO-sponsored scholars continue to be eligible to attend U.S. universities? Will Americans continue to be invited to UNESCO-sponsored social science meetings and seminars? Will Americans be eligible for contracts and study grants aimed at strengthening Third World social science institutions?

2. Is the executive branch considering any new program, through the Social Science Research Council or some other organization, that will strengthen the U.S. contribution to the development of social science in Africa, Asia, and Latin America?

AG 55

UNESCO: Women's Issues and Human Rights

Issue: Termination of U.S. role as a leader at UNESCO on women's issues and human rights; resulting political damage.

Background

Americans who have been involved with UNESCO point out that the United States has taken a leading role on womens issues, at least since the early 1970s, and on human rights. The last two U.S. representatives to UNESCO have been women, and according to one expert, the United States has repeatedly named female delegates to UNESCO panels of experts and other activities. Pressure has been applied to UNESCO to expand the hiring of women for professional positions, and the United States has supported efforts to fund research projects on women's issues. Meanwhile, the United States has also encouraged a heightened awareness of human rights concerns in UNESCO programs and other activities. U.S. delegates reportedly played an important role in drafting UNESCO procedures that allow artists, students, teachers, and scientists to file complaints against violations of their human rights.

Concerns

Some observers are concerned that the U.S. withdrawal will lead to a loss of momentum at the organization on human rights and women's issues. The UNESCO bureaucracy, some maintain, has been insensitive to the need to place more women in high-level positions, and continued U.S. pressure was required to persuade them to move forward in this area. Meanwhile, it is argued, many Third World members of UNESCO are little interested in women's rights, so that — in the absence of U.S. representation — UNESCO programs will be less likely to take women's concerns into account. Meanwhile, with

---

^ Prepared by Raymond W. Copson, Specialist in International Relations.

their influence enhanced by the U.S. withdrawal, the Communist countries may become more effective at deflecting Western efforts to expose their human rights violations.

Another concern is that the United States will suffer political losses by sacrificing its leadership role on women's issues and human rights. The United States and its policies were often criticized at UNESCO on a variety of issues, such as U.S. advocacy of "constructive engagement" as a means of promoting racial change in South Africa. However, attempts by critics to portray the United States as a "reactionary" power opposed to the interests of the Third World nations were undercut by the forthright U.S. stand in favor of women's rights and human rights. The poor record of many of the critics on these same issues damaged their credibility in attacking the United States.

Now, many fear, the critics may come to dominate an important world forum in which they can freely condemn the United States. The fact that the United States had been at the forefront of the effort to advance the interests of women and promote respect for human rights around the globe will soon fade from view.

An alternative position is that the United States -- and the causes of women and human rights -- will suffer little as a result of the U.S. withdrawal. UNESCO had been slow, those who hold this view point out, to bring women into professional positions and it is not clear that there would have been much additional progress even if the United States had remained in the organization. Nor, despite research projects and other activities, is there evidence that UNESCO programs were making much progress against discrimination and human rights abuses. Moreover, according to this view, critics of the

United States at UNESCO did not appear to be restrained by the U.S. record on these issues, and their condemnations can hardly become more vocal.

Questions

1. Can you outline the U.S. stance on women's issues and human rights at UNESCO prior to our withdrawal? Are you concerned that the U.S. voice on these issues will now be stilled?

2. Would you say that UNESCO was making progress in bringing women into professional positions before the U.S. withdrawal? If there was progress, will it now be slowed?

3. With the United States withdrawal, aren't you concerned that critics of the United States at UNESCO will have a free field of fire on such issues as our policy of "constructive engagement" toward South Africa.

UNESCO: Peace Research and Disarmament*

Issue: Possible loss of U.S. influence in UNESCO programs dealing with peace research and disarmament; possible gains for the Soviet Union.

Background

UNESCO supports the field of "peace research," dealing with such issues as arms races and the causes of war, through Program XIII.1, "Maintenance of Peace and International Organization, with a planned budget of $949,000 in regular UNESCO funds in 1984 and 1985. Program XIII.3, "Education for Peace and Respect for Human Rights and the Rights of Peoples," with a proposed 1984-1985 budget of $2,725,500, supports several education projects aimed at promoting peace and disarmament.

Concerns

Observers who have followed UNESCO activities in peace research and disarmament are concerned at the loss of U.S. ability to influence the direction of these programs. Some point out that the Soviet Union and the other Eastern European countries have a well-developed curriculum, as well as instructional materials, in these fields. The thrust of the Communist presentation, of course, is to portray capitalist societies in general, and the United States in particular, as the principal causes of international tensions -- and the Soviet Union as a sincere advocate of international peace and understanding.

Consequently, some fear, the U.S. withdrawal presents the Soviets with an opportunity rapidly to take over the UNESCO program and to disseminate their view of international tensions around the world under UN auspices. UNESCO might also be used, some believe, to strengthen nuclear disarmament

---

* Prepared by Raymond W. Copson, Specialist in International Relations.

forces in Western and less developed nations allied with the United States. It may be that some of the UNESCO peace research programs have already promoted ideas which tend to work against U.S. defense policy. Nonetheless, it is argued, the U.S. delegation has been successful in the past in preventing UNESCO from hosting meetings or undertaking educational programs that would have become channels for promoting views hostile to U.S. interests.

According to another point of view, however, UNESCO programs in peace research and disarmament are small and have little potential for significant damage to the United States. Such programs are probably outside UNESCOs mandate in education, science, and culture in any event, it is argued, but at their present level of funding they are not worth great concern. In terms of subject matter, some maintain, the peace research and disarmament programs are already anti-Western in their orientation, so that any damage they suffer will not be harmful to U.S. interests.

Question

Are you concerned that the U.S. departure from UNESCO will lead to increased Soviet influence over UNESCO's peace research and disarmament programs? Won't this prove damaging to U.S. interests?

GENERAL INFORMATION PROGRAM*

Issue: The future of U.S. participation in the international exchange of knowledge, including the UNESCO General Information Program (PGI)

Background

The UNESCO infrastructure for library and information programs and archival development is the General Information Program (PGI). PGI was established in 1976 to provide a unified focus for UNESCO's diverse activities in the areas of library and information science, archives, and scientific and technological information. PGI is generally highly regarded. The entire UNESCO program for information systems and access to knowledge was approximately $19 million for 1984 and 1985 with $12 million coming from the UNESCO budget. PGI has five principal themes relating to the support of development of 1) information policies and plans; 2) methods, norms, and standards for information handling; 3) information infrastructures; 4) specialized information systems; and 5) education and training of information specialists and users. PGI is responsible for the worldwide information networks such as the UNISIST program, which facilitates the transfer of scientific and technical information between countries. Increased world wide awareness of information problems, national systems needs, and the potential for international cooperation and exchange have made PGI an increasingly important program, according to many information systems experts. The current director of the PGI is an American. The United States cannot participate in the International Council for PGI as a nonmember.

---

* Prepared by Lois McHugh, Foreign Affairs Analyst

Concerns:

Six distinctive concern relating to knowledge exchange have been raised.

Standards setting

A major concern expressed in this area is the role of FGI in standard setting for information programs and equipment. Many believe it is important for commercial and scientific reasons that the United States take an active part in international standard setting, because many countries produce the equipment used in the information field. Standards adopted which are incompatible with U.S. computers, telecommunications systems, information products and services could cost United States companies millions of dollars in lost business. For example, if standards of electronic transmission of data are developed which U.S. manufacturers do not use, it might be necessary for them to redesign their systems. Systems incompatible to U.S. systems would also prevent U.S. scholars and institutions from using the international data banks. UNESCO does not establish standards itself, but it does organize meetings and provide funds for some international organizations which do establish standards. Within the U.S. information community there are various levels of concern. A spokesman for one of the major computer companies indicated that the damage would be minimal if the United States stayed out of UNESCO for only one or two years. Three or more years, on the other hand, would be more serious. In that time period, not only could some standards be changed, but others would be in progress. It is difficult to change standards once established.

In other areas, such as library and information services, UNESCO has not been involved in providing financial support for standard setting but it has been involved in guiding the discussions by hosting meetings and participating in meetings on standards. Many believe that it is commercially important that the United States be involved in standard setting discussions wherever they are held.

A counter view is that U.S. manufacturers hold such a large share of the information systems market that UNESCO would be unlikely to sponsor changes that were incompatible wil U.S. equipment. But manufacturers might still be reluctant to run the risk that some UNESCO-sponsored change would give Japanese or other competitors an edge in new markets or new fields. It could be argued that U.S. manufacturers would be free to adopt any change recommended by a UNESCO body, but some would point out that such changes could be expensive.

In both the equipment and the library and information service areas, it has been suggested that the United States could protect its interests by increasing its participation in alternative organizations such as the International Telegraphic Union, and the International Standards Organization. Other organizations identified by the U.S. National Committee for UNESCO PGI include the International Council for Scientific and Technical Information, International Council of Archives, International Federation for Documentation, and International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions. Presently, the United States has a very low level of participation in these organizations. The dues to maintain participation in these organizations and provide travel expenses to meetings are modest.

Education and Training

A second area of concern is in education and training. PGI programs are important first, because American trained library and information people are more likely to share our values, and second, because many believe they receive better training in the United States than in most other countries. Training also has a commercial value. It is generally acknowledged that the information system people learn to use first is usually the one they prefer in later years. It is important that U.S. hardware, software, and training programs be part of international training programs. U.S. equipment and training programs are unlikely to be used by UNESCO in our absence because so many other countries produce the same types of equipment and will encourage the use of their equipment. It is also difficult for Third World countries to purchase U.S. equipment without some sort of subsidy, such as that provided by UNESCO programs. One alternative to UNESCO suggested by some is the Agency for International Development, which already has programs for strengthening the information infrastructure in developing countries. The same organizations cited above by the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO PGI also have educational and training activities which the United States could support.

Free Trans-border Information Flows

The unrestricted flow of scientific and technical information across borders is another concern expressed. Approximately 75 percent of worldwide research and development is performed outside the United States, according to the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO PGI. PGI has been a leader in encouraging an unrestricted flow of information and promoting the

development of information networks. Others contend, however, that most important research will continue to be published in U.S. or Western scientific journals and damage to U.S. scientific research would be minimal.

UNESCO is about to begin an examination of the impact of the free flow of information on developing countries. Without U.S. participation, concern has been expressed that this study could follow the path of the New World Information Order in taking on anti-Western overtones. Others contend, however, that many international organizations will be involved in this study and the United States will be able to make its views known. Book sales abroad generate many millions of dollars in business to U.S. companies. Some have suggested that these sales are dependent on the continued availability of free flow agreements. Others point out that such agreements are bilateral and argue that UNESCO activities have little to do with them.

Archives

UNESCO archival programs are another area of concern. UNESCO funds the preparation of manuals, training programs and expert surveys in this field. It is feared that archival programs in the Third World will suffer, and that U.S. scholars using Third World archives will find little information surviving. Others suggest that there are viable alternatives to UNESCO such as the International Council on Archives, which has training programs and expert surveys, the Society of American Archivists which have training manuals, and the U.S. National Archives and Record Service.

Coordination of U.S. Participation

Concern was also expressed about the lack of coordination of U.S. participation in the many international organizations dealing with information because of our withdrawal from the International Council for the General Information Program. It was suggested that coordination of U.S. participation in international information organizations could be improved by funding another secretariat which is in the planning stages, the Institute for International Information Programs, under the National Federation of Abstracting and Information Services. In the area of scientific and technological information exchange, an alternative suggestion is that the United States could join the Intergovernmental Bureau for Informatics and play a more active role in OECD and the U.N. Center for Transnational Corporations.

Soviet Role

Finally, the future role of the Soviets in UNESCO information programs is a very great concern. The Soviets have stated since U.S. withdrawal that they intend to play a greater role in the PGI. On the other hand France and Germany are on the International Council for PGI and can be expected to work in our interests and against greater Soviet involvement, according to one expert.

Questions

1. Will the United States continue to participate in the PGI? [If the answer is no, the follow-up question is...] What plans are there for ensuring the coordination of U.S. participation in international library, archival, and information programs?

2. What effect will our inability to remain members of the International Council for the PGI have on the direction of its programs? On the current Director of the PGI? On international standard setting?

3. What kind of exchange programs does the United States have for persons

in the library and information field? Are there plans to increase these programs?

4. Do you anticipate that U.S. manufacturers will be harmed by U.S. withdrawal from the International Council for the PGI? If so, which industries or parts of industries will suffer?

5. In the absence of U.S. participation in the International Council for the PGI, what role should the private sector play in international standard setting in the information field?

STATISTICAL SERVICES*

Issue: The Future of U.S. participation in Unesco statistical services.

Background

The UNESCO Statistical Services section is not one of the 14 major programs of UNESCO. Instead it is a service which overlaps the sectors and provides information and statistics to UNESCO staffers and member states alike, as well as the training of personnel to provide and use statistics. UNESCO statistics cover all of its subject areas and include such business related statistics as book, movie, and newspaper production, and number of college graduates in various scholarly and technical fields. The statistics are considered reliable. UNESCO statistics are used by many U.S. government agencies for forecasting, and by some of the larger state governments, by scholars, and by businesses and industries with business connections in other countries and in searching for new markets.

Concerns

Many experts question whether U.S. statistical information will continue to be included in UNESCO statistical publications. UNESCO contact with the United States is through the Department of State, but the statistical information provided comes from many U.S. government agencies. Although it will be possible to obtain the statistics for other countries, many businesses also are concerned that the statistics on the United States be included. Among the users of UNESCO statistics, the book publishing industry has expressed particular concern.

Another concern is the future of the UNESCO statistics section itself. This section is funded entirely by the UNESCO Regular budget and any

---

*Prepared by Lois McHugh, Foreign Affairs Analyst

budget cut would affect statistical services. The effect of a budget cut could be either a decline in the quality of the statistics or a delay in publishing them. Either of these consequences would be a serious concern to U.S. users.

Those who express concern about a budget cut explain that the Soviet Union is the next largest contributor to UNESCO after the United States, and insist that they have no interest in statistical services provided by UNESCO. Others contend that there is no evidence that the Soviet Union will want to cut the statistical services budget. They also point out that OECD also maintains statistics in the education field which provide much of the information the U.S. needs. These are reportedly in the process of being improved and may some day replace UNESCO statistics in education. Other data on such topics as culture, book publication, library volumes, and school enrollment is available only from UNESCO.

A related concern is the future quality of UNESCO statistics due to a decline in the number of American staff in the statistics section. U.S. statisticians are better than those of most other countries, including industrialized countries, according to some. Critics suggest that the number of Americans in this section is already very small, and a decline won't matter.

Questions

1. Are you concerned about the possible decline in the quality of the widely-used UNESCO statistics? Have you conducted any investigation to determine to what degree U.S. government agencies, as well as the private sector, are dependent on these statistics?

2. How will you ensure that U.S. statistics will continue to be included in UNESCO statistical publications? Which U.S. agencies are involved?

3. How adequate are OECD or other statistics for U.S. purposes?

COPYRIGHT*

Issue: Whether the United States will be invited to meetings on copyright and related rights convened under the auspices of Unesco; and, if so, whether the Department of State will fully accredit delegates to participate in such meetings and supply the necessary financing.

Background: At the forty-eighth session of the U.S. National Commission for Unesco on December 13, 1984, the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations, Mr. Gregory Newell, indicated generally that the United States would continue to contribute to, and participate in "the Copyright Convention," and play a policy role in activities under the Convention. Transcript, at 49. Since the Universal Copyright Convention is the only major multilateral copyright convention to which the United States is a party, presumably Mr. Newell was referring to that instrument.

The Universal Copyright Convention was prepared in the years following World War II, and signed at Geneva on September 6, 1952, primarily to bridge the gap between European countries members of the Berne Convention on the protection of literary and artistic works, and the United States and other countries in the Western Hemisphere whose copyright systems did not meet Berne standards. Unesco played a major role in facilitating the establishment of this Convention, convening groups of experts to study the relevant issues and providing other assistance. The Convention was revised in July 1971 to accommodate the needs of developing countries.

The Director-General of Unesco was assigned, in various articles of the Universal Copyright Convention, specific depository duties. Unesco was also invited in an annexed Resolution to provide the Secretariat for

---

* Prepared by Patrice Lyons, Ar. Attorney-Advisor, Copyright Office

the Intergovernmental Committee established under Article XI of the Convention. The Intergovernmental Copyright Committee studies problems arising in connection with the application and operation of the Convention, makes preparation for periodic revisions, studies any other problems concerning the international protection of copyright, and informs member States of its activities. The United States was recently reelected to a six year term on the Committee. Apart from its role as Secretariat for the Committee, Unesco also sponsors seminars, training programs and other activities designed to assist countries in preparing copyright laws and establishing related organizations.

In addition to its copyright activities, Unesco also promotes the development and provides support services for multilateral instruments in related areas that are of interest to the U.S. For example, the Agreement on the importation of educational, scientific and cultural material, known as the Florence Agreement, was adopted by the General Conference of Unesco in 1950. The Agreement seeks to reduce tariff and trade obstacles to the international circulation of these informational materials and thus promote the flow of ideas. The Agreement was amended in 1976 to expand the coverage of the agreement. Unesco also participates with WIPO and the International Labour Organization in providing the Secretariat for the International Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of [illegible] and Broadcasting Organizations that was signed at Rome in October 1961. Unesco has sought to attract interest in the Rome Convention by negotiating a model law to assist countries in drafting implementing legislation and other activities. Although the United States participated in the preparation of the Rome Convention, it is not a party to this instrument. The United States is a member of the Florence Agreement.

Congress: Since the United States did not automatically cease to be a party to the Universal Copyright Convention when it withdrew from Unesco, and the current Rules of Procedure of the Intergovernmental Copyright Committee do not require Committee members to be members of Unesco, at least technically the United States' legal posture under the Convention does not appear altered. As a practical matter, however, the U.S. may not be invited to meetings convened under the auspices of Unesco. This may even include meetings of the Intergovernmental Copyright Committee. The Unesco Regulations for the general classification of the various categories of meetings convened by Unesco may be interpreted to exclude the U.S. from certain types of meetings. This would indeed be unfortunate since new international agreements such as the Convention Relating to the Distribution of Programme-Carrying Signals Transmitted by Satellite, that will shortly enter into force for the United States, were drafted by governmental experts at meetings convened under the auspices of Unesco. In a few instances, the United States may attend certain copyright meetings at the invitation of the Director-General of the World Intellectual Property Organization; however, the invitation may not allow them to participate fully in the sessions.

It is clear that the United States will cease to have any role in shaping copyright projects undertaken by Unesco itself. This may hamper future U.S. relations with developing countries that look to Unesco for guidance in the preparation and revision of copyright laws and the establishment of related organizations. For almost thirty years, important

developments in international copyright and related areas were given direction by the United States through its participation in the Unesco General Conference and Executive Board, and the presence of U.S. nationals in the Unesco Copyright Division.

Last fall, the Department of State took up once again the issue of U.S. membership in the Berne Convention on the protection of literary and artistic works in light of the impending U.S. withdrawal from Unesco. Congress has also recently enacted trade measures that may help improve U.S. copyright relations with other countries. Whether these or other initiatives prove adequate to make up for the diminished status of the U.S. in Unesco-related copyright activities remains to be seen. Steps taken to strengthen U.S. copyright relations with other countries may prove an enhancement rather than an adequate substitute for U.S. membership in Unesco.

Specific names and addresses of representatives of copyright industries potentially impacted by U.S. withdrawal from Unesco may be developed, if this would be of assistance in the further consideration of this subject.

Questions:

1. Has the Department of State ascertained whether Unesco will continue to invite the U.S. to participate fully, and not just as observers, at copyright related meetings, including, in particular, meetings of the Intergovernmental Copyright Committee?

2. Has the Department of State requested funds to send U.S. delegations to future copyright meetings convened under the auspices of Unesco? If the U.S. is invited to such meetings, would the State Department accredit the delegates to participate fully, and not just as observers?

EXHIBITS

1. The texts of the Universal Copyright Convention, as signed at Geneva on September 6, 1952, and as revised at Paris in July 1971, are reprinted in Circular 38c, International Copyright Conventions. The U.S. is party to both instruments.
2. The international copyright relations of the United States are summarized in an appendix to Treaties in Force (1984).
3. The U.S. deposited its instrument of ratification of the Convention Relating to the Distribution of Program-Carrying Signals Transmitted by Satellite on December 7, 1984, and the Convention will enter into force for the U.S. three months after this date.
4. Regulations for the general classification of the various categories of meetings convened by Unesco are reprinted in the Manual of the General Conference.
5. Rules of Procedure of the Intergovernmental Committee of the Universal Copyright Convention as revised in 1971 are reprinted in Unesco document REC (1971)/EB.2/1 prov., Annex III.
6. Sample letter of invitation to a meeting of the Intergovernmental Copyright Committee established under the Universal Copyright Convention as revised in 1971.

7. A copy of a recent Report of the Intergovernmental Copyright Committee that illustrates some issues that come before the Committee (HDC (1971)/IV/20 (1982).

8. A recent Act that illustrates a possible alternative trade law approach to international copyright relations.

9. Minutes of a meeting of the International Copyright Panel of the Department of State's Advisory Committee on International Intellectual Property (Sept. 12, 1984). The impact of U.S. withdrawal from Unesco on future U.S. participation in the Universal Copyright Convention was not specifically discussed on that occasion. Possible U.S. adherence to the Berne Convention was the main agenda item.

○